

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasotra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/004,089 | 10/23/2001 | William A. Fischer | 10017888 -1 | 9254 | |
| HEWLETT-P. | 7590 03/31/2008 ACKARD COMPANY | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| Intellectual Property Administration | | | TANG, KAREN C | | |
| P.O. Box 2724 Fort Collins, C | 00 0 80527-2400 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 2151 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 03/31/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| 10/004,089 | FISCHER, WILLIAM A. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| KAREN C. TANG | 2151 | |

| | KAREN C. TANG | 2151 | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 3 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IF | N CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE | | |
| M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i | iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of | | 36(a) and the appropriat | e extension fee |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (0) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl | iones with 27 CER 44 27 must be 4 | Slad within two manths | a of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDMENTS | A service to the state of Change being | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | sideration and/or search (see NOT v); | E below); | |
| They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially rec | lucing or simplifying t | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s). | owable if submitted in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [| | be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | ided below or appended. | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: None. | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.24-27 and 33-36. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None. | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | before or on the date of filing a No | tice of Appeal will not | be entered |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing an entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce hecause: |
| See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | | condition for allowar | oo boddaoo. |
| 13. Other: | | | |
| /John Follansbee/ | | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151 | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the cited art of records is silent in regards to "computer-assisted equipement receiving content including audio...and instant replay and for displaying pertinenet text inforamtion on the display". Examiner disagrees.

It is understood that the computer-assisted equipement from Kusano received streaming/buffering the information such as literatures, movies, and music in the computer assisted equipements (refer to 0031); computer assisted equipement contains a remote control device (a module within the computer assisted equipeemnt) that receives the interface instruction (refer to 0044-0047) Kusano did not specifically disclosed the teaching to receiving the video information, however, Jain, disclosed the limitation in Col 7, Lines 35-85, received and buffered the multi-media data, which including video, audio and text.

Further, it is the selector on the computer-assisted equipement that controls the freeze frame, and instant replay and for displaying the pertinenet text information on the display (refer to 0046-0048).

Applicant argues that the cited and of records teach away from applicant's invention, such as applicant 'cliented' the plurality user interfaces that resides and operate on the individual devices. However, examiner disagrees. Within any device in the originary skill in the art of communication system, there are plurality of "interface" resides within the device. Further, applicant did not specifically claimed the "plurality" of "interface" within the claim lanaqueur. Therefore, applicants' steach away "analyse would not apt specifically claimed the "plurality" of "interface" within the claim lanaqueur. Therefore, applicants' steach away "analyse would not apt specifically claimed the "plurality" of "interface" within the claim lanaqueur. Therefore, applicants' steach away "analyse would not applicants" steach away "analyse would not applicants" steach as a specific and the plurality of "interface" within the claim lanaqueur.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).